WG-Trial-Coverage HW 1/18/73

see Baldwin's Brown testimony

The NYTimes continues schizoid, inadequate reporting and crusading editorial today. Like all others, it continues not to understand the nature of the trial and the judge, yet goes farthur in noting that the criminal is prosecuting himself. However, it is nutty to say that nothing could be accomplished by calling those who copped pleas as witnesses. Much could be. I suspect the deal includes immunity, for they'd not pedld guilty to avoid public airing and then testify. There is nothing to prevent their being called as witnesses, because double-jeopardy protects them. They don't even have to take the fifth. And especially with the judge having called them liars would there be compulsion in calling them. If they lie about the material under oath that is an entirely new crime, perjury, for which they can be tried and jailed, and the sentences need not be concurrent. So, if this were a serious prosecution and if the judge had serious purposes as he pretends, they'd not miss this and there is no need for the pontificating Times to cover them both.

It and the Post go for what nobody can possibly believe, but appears from the coverage to have been entirely unquestioned: there were two (maybe three) radios for picking up the transmissions of the bugs and tape recorders for each and there was no taping because the recorders could not be connected to the radios?

First of all, as is obvious, they require no connection. Tape recorders have microphones, even the very cheapest (not the kind to go with the super-expensive receiver McCord is known to have bought). All, including the very cheapest, have input plugs. All radios, even the very cheapest, have output plugs. All that is required to connect them is a cheap patchcord. Besides, it is stretching too thin to suggest that the electronics expert on the deal was this incompetent. There were tapes and Baldwin is lying is the most obvious explanation. If this is the case, I'd expect he is also lying in tender areas, like who in the White House or CREEP got, to protect those who did get. I dongt think he'd willingly squeal, so I infer that when he was caught he made the best of it. Interestingly, I have not noticed any mention of his qualification for the FBI or reason for leaving. Most agents are lawyers or accountants. Now here he was, a former agent, and willing to work inordinate hours, part-time, for only $225 a week and the pie-in-the-sky of the bright future with RMN's re-election? Not reasonable of something wrong with him. Always good jobs for ex-agents who are in Bureau terms clean.

Interesting that with Bittman out of case, prosecution attempted to introduce names of those spied upon. Not necessary to case. Could only hurt 'ems, not help case or defendants.

Post downplayed p.8.

Interesting that when prosecutor got to logs, instead of asking if McCord told him what he did with them, he asked instead,"Do you know what Mr. McCord did with the logs?"Unless he was present, Baldwin had to say and did say,"No."Privately, in response to the right question, he has named three.

Post gives one Jose Felip Piedra as one of eight names in Barker's notebook. Joseph Reynaldo Granda unknown here. But the name Piedra is not, and it does not appear to be a Cuban equivalent of "Smith". Orlando Piedro was the arm of the MNR, one of the more reactionary and violence-prone of the revanchist groups headquartered in Miami. He was in on the deal where a former Cuban reporter known as The Chinaman was set up north of Lake Pontchartrain, MNR camp run by Ricardo Davis as sucker-bait, kidnapped to Miami, and beaten thoroughly early 8/63. Chimaman Fernando Fernandez (O in NO.O.)

Neither paper has reported the testimony of most of the prosecution witnesses, including the detective who tocked off the list of what was captured. Some only was mentioned, and in generalities. Neither reported what is in my yesterday's note, that Sirica told the prosecution to finish with Baldwin yesterday, in a matter of about two hours. He had to know that Morgan would object to mention of the names or content of what was intercepted, and he had to recognize Morgan in court. The ACLU did file an action on this. The monkey-businessof the no-monket-business judge.